REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated July 25, 2008. Claims 1 to 22 are pending, of which Claims 1, 7 and 21 are independent. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

All claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), primarily over U.S. Patent 5,467,434 (Hower) in view of U.S. Patent 6,289,371 (Kumpf '371). More precisely, Claims 1 to 3, 5, 7 to 10, 12, 21, 23 and 24 were rejected over Hower in view of Kumpf '371, and Claims 4, 6, 11, 13 to 20 and 22 were rejected over Hower in view of Kumpf '371, and further in view of U.S. Patent 7,215,434 (Janse). Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested, as explained more fully below.

The invention concerns fulfillment of a scan order over a computer network, and involves a system having at least three constituent components: a local computer terminal, an order entry server computer, and a scanner node. These three constituent components cooperate so as to achieve fulfillment of a scan order. The computer terminal is adapted to invoke a scan order entry form, which is obtained from the order entry server, for input of a scanner node, a scan setting for causing the inputted scanner node to scan an image, and a destination for sending the scanned image. The order entry server is configured to reconcile the inputted scan setting with a capability profile of the inputted scanner node, and to create and distribute a scan order in accordance with the reconciliation result. The scanner node is configured to select a scan order from a plurality of scan orders

- 15 -

received from order entry servers, to generate a scanned image based on the selected scan

order, and to send the scanned image to the destination included in the selected scan order.

The claims herein have been amended so as to accentuate the following

features of the invention. First, the destination for sending the scanned image is part of the

input provided via the scan order entry form, and it is provided by a user at the computer

terminal. Second, the scan order is selected by a user operation, and it is selected at the

scanner node.

For example, in one representative embodiment of the invention described

in the originally-filed application, a scan order entry form 900 may contain multiple fields,

as shown in Figure 9. These fields include a field to select a particular scanner node, a

field to select scan settings, and a field to select a destination for sending the scanned

image. See page 7, lines 1 to 14. These fields are completed by a user at the computer

terminal, based on the scan order entry form which is received from an order entry server.

At the scanner node, there is a list of prioritized scan orders (step 630 of

Figure 6) and a selection of one of the scan orders in the queue of the scanner node (step

635). See page 10, lines 3 through 189. A display such as that shown in Figures 12A

through 12C is provided at a user interface of the scanner node. The user interface of

Figure 12A permits viewing of scan orders, the user interface of Figure 12B is an example

of a list of scan orders in the scanner node's queue, and the user interface of Figure 12C

illustrates a scan order that has been selected for processing. See page 8, lines 4 to 9.

Thus, according to claimed features of the invention, it is a user that inputs

all of a scanner node, a scan setting for causing the inputted scanner node to scan an image,

- 16 -

and a destination for sending the scanned image. The user inputs this information at a computer terminal via a scan order entry form obtained from an order entry server. The order entry server computer reconciles the inputted scan setting with a capability profile of the inputted scanner node, and creates and distributes a scan order in accordance with the reconciliation result. At the scanner node, a user operation selects a scan order from a plurality of scan orders received from order entry servers. The scanner node is thereafter configured to generate a scanned image based on the selected scan order, and to send the scanned image to the destination included in the selected scan order.

In contrast to the foregoing arrangement, the patent to Hower is not seen to disclose a scanning system with scanning nodes and a scan order, but rather is seen to disclose a printing selection system. This point is conceded by the USPTO in its Office Action. Thus, Hower does not teach to input a destination for sending a scanned image, for the reason that in a printing selection system, there is no sending of a scanned image.

Moreover, in the system of Hower, the user of a printing selection system does not operate the printer at the printer, in contrast to the invention wherein a user operation effects selection of a scan order at a scanner node.

The Office Action cited to Kumpf '371 in support of its opinion that it would have been known to adapt the Hower printing selection system into a scan order fulfillment system. Naturally, Applicant disagrees with this assertion, since there are fundamental differences between a printing selection system and a scan order fulfillment system. Moreover, with particular focus on the claim language, it is understood by Applicant that Kumpf '371 fails to disclose or to suggest a system in which a user inputs

- 17 -

all of a scanner node, a scan setting for causing the inputted scanner node to scan an image, and a destination for sending the scanned image. Rather, in Kumpf '371, the user operates a browser displayed on client 12 for scanning the image and for sending the scanned image. MFP 16 sends the scanned image to client 12, which the user operates without inputting the destination for sending the scanned image.

It is also Applicant's opinion that Kumpf '371 fails to disclose or to suggest that it is a user operation at a scanner node that selects a scan order from amongst a plurality of scan orders received from order entry servers. Rather, Kumpf '371 is not seen to disclose or to suggest any operation of the user at the scanner node.

Janse has been reviewed, but is not seen to add anything to the foregoing discussion of the deficiencies in Hower and Kumpf '371, as references against the claims.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that the claims herein recite subject matter that would not have been obvious from any permissible combination of the applied references, and allowance is respectfully requested.

- 18 -

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa,

California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to

our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

Attorney for Applicant
Michael K. O'Neill
Registration No.: 32,622

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCHS_WS 2505Z55v1

- 19 -